

# Oxford

# Democrat.

VOLUME 6.

PARIS, MAINE, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1838.

NUMBER 7.

OXFORD DEMOCRAT,  
IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY BY  
G. W. MILLIETT.

TERMS—One dollar and fifty cents in advance.  
One dollar & seventy-five cents at the end of 6 months.  
Two dollars at the end of the year.

No paper discontinued till all dues are paid, but at  
the option of the publisher.

ADVERTISEMENTS inserted on the usual terms,  
the proprietor not being responsible for any error in  
any advertisement beyond the amount charged for it.

COMMUNICATIONS, and LETTERS on business must be  
addressed to the publisher, Post-paid.

From the New York Post.

## FEDERAL ABUSE OF LITERARY MEN.

We have often had it in our minds to animadver upon the extreme narrowness of spirit which denies to literary men the due need of their labors on account of their political opinions. This illiberal spirit has lately manifested itself in several flagrant instances, which a correspondent has enumerated in the article which follows.

## MALIGNITY OF THE WHIGS.

Many whig papers and whig orators have given to political controversy, of late, a littleness and malignity heretofore unknown. This has chiefly been directed against those members of the democratic party who chance to be respected or distinguished for their literary attainments or religious character. Some of the most distinguished writers of our country, it is well known, lean to the democratic side, and no sooner does any indication of a liberal spirit appear in their writings than the whig press unites in a general effort to strip them of their well-earned literary laurels. Authors, whose admirable productions these self-same editors have praised for years, are suddenly discovered to be destitute of talent and knowledge. Men whose characters have commanded the highest respect for professional superiority and moral worth, no sooner avow themselves to be friends of democracy than every occasion is seized to ridicule their religious character and destroy the estimation in which they have been held as men of sound judgment and learning.

The reader of these remarks will readily call to mind numerous instances which show the peculiar malignity we allude to. Mr. Cooper had done honor to our country by his productions. All Europe, as well as America, acknowledged him to be one of the leading writers of fiction of the present age, and he was, by general consent, placed by the side of Sir Walter Scott. Mr. Cooper returned to his native land, whose character he had so nobly defended when abroad. He boldly raised his voice in defense of patriotism and truth—not in the spirit of a partisan, but with the dignity of a philosopher, defending the principles of our government, for which foreign observation had increased his attachment. The universal whig press raised its hue and cry: it attacked, not Mr. Cooper's political pamphlet or principles, but his literary and personal character—it struggled to tear from his brow the wreath of fame which his country was proud to see him wear; it slandered his productions, decried his genius, condemned his principles, contradicted his observations, and resorted to every foul artifice to degrade his literary and personal character. It copied and hawked about the despicable slanders of English Tory periodicals; indeed, this garbage is always like cordial to the whig taste. Was Mr. Cooper an editor or a candidate for office? Oh no,—a private citizen, who simply dared, in a free country, to express his political sentiments! Fortunately, his firmness of character is too great to suffer any annoyance from the contemptible and fiendish spirit of partisanship.

Mr. Cooper is but one of a long list who have been assailed with equal virulence. Was there not a time when the pen of William Leggett had raised for him an enviable reputation as a man of letters? Was he not regarded as one of the most vigorous, copious and attractive writers of the day? How his literary laurels were scorched and malediced by whig rancor, the moment he advanced as a champion for the cause of man. Vain bitterness! The noble genius of this champion has yet a victory in store, if his life be spared, which shall confound his enemies. The writer of this knows him only through his writings, but feels sure that his mind cannot long remain inactive.

Washington Irving is now suspected of democracy. Had he accepted the nomination for Mayor it would have been discovered suddenly by the entire whig press that he has neither genius nor learning. One of the whig journals threatened him, in advance, with the loss of his literary reputation should he become the democratic candidate.

Mr. Paulding must be subjected to the same rancorous abuse—the same persevering, malignant, ungenerous and dastardly series of sneers, attacks, insinuations, and falsehoods which have been heaped upon Cooper and Leggett.

This spirit is not peculiar to New York. Mr. Bancroft, of Massachusetts, the Historian of the United States, was attacked with the concentrated malice of whig intolerance. His religious character was made the subject of especial abuse. Even in the Monthly Magazine, devoted to whiggery and literature, in this city, he was jeered as the "Reverend Mr. Bancroft,"

and pronounced insane. Now it was well known that Mr. Bancroft never was a clergyman—though if he had been, it would be no disgrace, as it certainly is not to the Reverend Edward Everett, now Governor of Massachusetts, who was once pastor of a church.

The same peculiar bitterness was poured out upon the head of Mr. Alexander H. Everett, confessedly one of the best scholars in America.

So, too, in Pennsylvania, the learning and eminence of Ingersoll, Dallas and Gilpin, only seemed to make them more especially the objects of the most brutal attacks of the whigs.

Not a whig essay or pamphlet comes from the press but it is lauded and extolled as a miraculous production. The learned and elegant address of Mr. Woodbury, before the American Historical Society, replete with philosophical views and rich with illustrations, was left unnoticed by the whigs, or was spoken of with scorn. Mr. Cass' address shared nearly the same fate.

See the ridicule which has been heaped upon Mr. Gouge's History of Banking, a work which, though not strictly methodical, comprises more facts and sound views, than any whig author has published on the same subject for the last twenty years.

Mr. Forrest has dared to appear on a public occasion before the democracy. We shall see—we have in fact already seen—the hell-bound of party forthwith let loose upon his good name as an acer and a patriot and a gentleman.

Of late the spitefulness of the whig press has been directed toward Mr. Butler. He has lived from childhood in the midst of one, of the people of the United States, in favor of its abolition; still it would not alter the case. That one State would be as free to abolish it, or not to abolish it, as it is now. This is a question which has never been submitted to the majority of the citizens of these United States, and, therefore, the citizens of the United States, as Citizens, have nothing to do with it.

The same thing is evident, from the most cursory view of the circumstances under which the Constitution was formed. Previously to the revolution, each of these States was an independent colony; constituted into a district government, by charter from the British crown. Each colony was a government as distinct from every other, as though it had been a thousand miles distant from all the rest; as distant, in fact, as are the different West India Islands from each other, or as any of the West India Islands, from the colony of Canada, of New Zealand, or of Bombay. They all held of the British Crown, but were all independent of each other, and the only bond of union by which they were connected together, was, that they were all subjects to the same king, and all acknowledged the ultimate authority of the constitutional laws of the empire.

When the independence of these colonies was established, this link, which bound each of them to the mother country, and thus indirectly to each other, was severed. They became independent States, having, each one for itself, power to make peace or war, or to form alliances, offensive and defensive, with what foreign State soever they severally chose. While in this condition, it is manifest that no State had any power whatever over any other State. Any one might have established slavery, or have abolished it, and no other one would have imagined that, in so doing, it was liable to any control from any other, or from all the rest; any more than from Canada, Austria, Russia, or the Sandwich Islands.

Under these circumstances, they chose, of their own sovereign will, to form a confederate government. In the formation of this government, each State, or the people of each State, mutually agreed to commit certain powers to the whole, and to submit the ultimate decision of certain questions to the majority of the whole people represented by their Senators and Representatives in Congress. What they have thus submitted to the decision of the majority, and nothing else, can be decided by the majority. What has not been submitted remains precisely as it was before, in the power of the citizens of the several States; and the citizens of the United States have no more to do with it, than they have with the affairs of Iceland.

The principle, in this case, is the same as that which governs partnerships. If twenty men put into common stock, each a thousand dollars, on condition that the whole, for certain purposes, shall be controlled by a majority of the proprietors, or of such persons as they may appoint, then the majority has a concerted right to control that property for those purposes. But that is all their power. They have no control over another dollar of the property of any proprietor, nor have they a right to control it for any other purposes than those for which it was contributed. Still less have they a right to control the political opinions of a proprietor, or to direct in what manner he shall educate his children, or govern his family. The principle in both cases is the same, and it is a very obvious one. It is simply this. No man is bound by any compact, any farther than he has bound

Waiving this, and granting it to be a violation of the law which God has ordained between man and man, and granting, also, that it is our duty to labor for its removal, I design merely to inquire what are the limits, within which our efforts, for the accomplishment of this purpose are to be restricted.

Our duty, on this subject, must, I think, be either as citizens of the United States, or as human beings, under law, to God.

I think it evident, that, as citizens of the United States, we have no power, whatever, either to abolish slavery in the Southern States, or to do any thing of which the direct intention is to abolish it. Whatever power we possess, as citizens of the United States, is conferred upon us by the constitution. This power is not conferred upon us by that instrument, and therefore it does not exist.

But this instrument has not merely a positive, it has also a negative power. It not only grants certain powers, but it expressly declares that those not enumerated are not granted. Thus,

it enacts that all "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved, to the States, respectively, or to the people." Now,

the abolition of slavery being a power not con-

ferred, it is, by this article, expressly withheld.

Whatever power we may, therefore, have over slavery, as citizens of the several States, within our limits, respectively, we have none, as citizens of the United States. The majority of the people in the United States, have, in this respect, no power over the minority; for the minority has never conceded to them this power.

But this is not quite all. As citizens of the United States we have solemnly promised to let it alone. We have declared that we leave to the States, respectively, and to the people of the States, whatever power they have not conceded to us. This is, by universal consent, acknowledged to be one of the powers thus left. We have, therefore, promised, as citizens of the United States, to let this alone. The concession has been made by both parties, and we hold the other party to it. Should the majority in Congress undertake to establish slavery in one of the free States, we should plead this very article, as a bar to the usurpation. But, the slaveholding States have precisely the same right to plead it against us, should we attempt any legislation in the case. Both parties have pledged themselves to abstain, and neither can interfere in the matter, without the violation of a solemn compact. In this respect, therefore, the Providence of God, and our own solemn obligations to each other, have precluded any action whatever.

But I go still farther. I hold that a compact,

binding in its spirit as well as in its letter,—

The spirit of the compact, I suppose, imposes upon me the obligation not to do anything for

the purpose of changing the relation of master and slave, except with the consent of the master.

I have no right to declare the abolition of slavery in another State—I have conceded that

this is to be left to the free choice of the citizens of that State.

I have no right to do any thing to degrade the parent in the eyes of his offspring than such inconsiderate folly,—nothing

more sure to destroy his influence over the mind, to harden the young heart in rebellion,

and make it grow bold in sin. In proportion

as the parent sinks in his esteem, self-conceit

grows up in the mind of the undutiful child.

Young people, as well as old, pay great respect

to consistency, and on the contrary, despise

those whose conduct is marked with caprice.

The sacred relation of parent is no protection

against this contempt. Those, therefore, who

would preserve their influence over their children, who would keep hold of the reins that may

guide them in periods of danger, and save them

from probable ruin, must take care not to ex-

hibit themselves as governed by passion or

whim, rather than fixed principles of justice

himself. In forming any society, there are, of, thoroughly trained in obedience, has at least necessity, certain individual rights, which a man one sharp struggle with his parent, in which submits to the decision of the majority. But, some decisive and humiliating mark of dis-

the surrenderer of these, involves the surrender

probation is demanded.

It should not, however, be overlooked, that

the necessity of punishment depends very

much upon the manner in which children are

treated. The greatest floggers have usually

a busy, scouring farmer's wife, with a large

family, the eldest fifteen years old, the young-

est three. She seldom crosses the room with-

out making some one of them stagger with a

vixenish slap on the side of the head. Yet

these were, without exception, the most noisy

mischiefous, rebellious little reprobates I ever

saw. The discipline of this mother was obvi-

ously not corrective, but nutritive of the vicious

habits of her children. The more she flogged

the more their disobedience flourished. Her

ill-judged castigation operated like a partial

hoeing among weeds, which only makes them

grow the faster. I have seen, on the other

hand, a teacher of a seminary, consisting of

eighty boys, succeed in governing the whole

school, while the heaviest punishment ever in-

flicted was that of making a boy lie in bed for

whole day. This teacher had a peculiar tact

for his profession; but a large share of his

skill lay in imperturbable cheerfulness of man-

ner an equanimity of temper which never de-

serted him. These prevented his being thrown

off his guard and secured him the good will and

confidence of his pupils and inclined them at

the outset to comply with his requisitions.

Fireside Education.

CORRECTING CHILDREN IN ANGER.—There is another common error, which may need to be noticed—that of correcting a child hastily and harshly, and then, feeling that injustice has been done, to compensate him by some

soothing sugar plum or honied apology. It is

not easy to conceive of any thing more likely

to degrade the parent in the eyes of his off-

spring than such inconsiderate folly,—nothing

more sure to destroy his influence over the

mind, to harden the young heart in rebellion,

and make it grow bold in sin. In proportion

as the parent sinks in his esteem, self-conceit

grows up in the mind of the undutiful child.

Young people, as well as old, pay great respect

to consistency, and on the contrary, despise

those whose conduct is marked with caprice.

The sacred relation of parent is no protection

against this contempt. Those, therefore, who

would preserve their influence over their children, who would keep hold of the reins that may

guide them in periods of danger, and save them

from probable ruin, must take care not to ex-

hibit themselves as governed by passion or

whim, rather than fixed principles of justice

and duty.

INDIAN ANECDOTE.—John Sequashequash,

an Indian of the remnants of a tribe in Con-

nnecticut, was some years since brought before

a justice of the peace on some charge or other,

which we do not now recollect. John happened

to be drunk at the time, and instead of an-

swering directly to the questions put by the

From the Globe.  
FAMILIAR DIALOGUES,  
BETWEEN A MERCHANT AND A FARMER.

No. 6.

*Farmer.* Well, Squire, your bank has resumed specific payments, I understand.

*Merchant.* Yes, we have resumed.

*F.* Now didn't you tell me and all my neighbors who came to your store to buy goods, that the State banks never could or would resume, until Congress established a Bank of the United States to regulate them?

*M.* Yes, I told you so.

*F.* The actual resumption of the State banks without the establishment of a Bank of the United States, proves that you were mistaken in that opinion, does it not?

*M.* I suppose it does.

*F.* I hope, then, you will give up that argument in favor of a National Bank.

*M.* I don't know.

*F.* And you told me you had to give ten per cent to get New York funds to pay for goods, and that things would never be better until a Bank of the United States was established to regulate domestic exchanges, did you not?

*M.* Yes, I did.

*F.* How much do you have to give for New York funds, now?

*M.* One per cent.

*F.* So domestic exchanges are regulated without a Bank of the United States, are they not?

*M.* They have come down.

*F.* There goes another of your great arguments in favor of a National Bank. Did you not tell us that commerce was dead, and would never revive without we had a United States Bank?

*M.* Yes, I did.

*F.* Is not commerce fast reviving, and becoming very active?

*M.* Yes.

*F.* So, there goes another of your arguments in favor of such a bank.

*D*id you not tell us that the price of produce was coming down, and that we should soon get nothing for our wheat, corn, and cattle unless a Bank of the United States was established?

*M.* I suppose I did.

*F.* Are not wheat, corn, and cattle higher than ever?

*M.* Yes, higher than I have known them for many years.

*F.* So, there goes another of your arguments in favor of a National Bank.

*D*id you not tell us that a vast number of laboring people were out of employment, and never would get any thing to do, until a Bank of the United States should be established?

*M.* Yes, such was my opinion.

*F.* Are they not all now employed that choose to be, and at high wages, too?

*M.* Yes, I believe it is so.

*F.* So there goes another argument in favor of a National bank.

*D*id you not tell us the Government could never get along without a Bank of the United States?

*M.* Yes, I told you so.

*F.* Well, has it not got along without such a bank every since 1833; and has it not got along without the help of any bank since May, 1838; and do not the Treasury and the Post Office Departments collect and disburse millions of dollars a year, without unusual difficulty or trouble?

*M.* They say so.

*F.* Well, there goes another of your great arguments in favor of a National Bank.

*N*ow, I should like to know, Squire, what arguments you have left in favor of a Bank of the United States.

*M.* We want a general currency to accommodate travellers. If you start on a journey with notes of the States banks, you can scarcely go a hundred miles until you get beyond the circle of their circulation, and they won't pass. The notes of the Bank of the United States were as good as silver everywhere.

*F.* Is not gold as good every where as the notes of a Bank of the United States can be?

*M.* I suppose it is.

*F.* Here, then, is "a general currency to accommodate travellers," without a Bank of the United States; is there not?

*M.* But gold cannot be had every where in sufficient quantities.

*F.* You must admit, however, that the quantity of gold coin in the country is constantly increasing, and that they are steadily diffusing themselves among the banks and the people. There is scarcely a bank which has not more or less of them. I understand your bank has a considerable quantity of gold. Has it not?

*M.* Yes; we have a hundred thousand dollars or more, but we do not pay it out.

*F.* Don't pay it out to persons who are going on journeys, and want it to pay their expenses?

*M.* No; it is more convenient to keep to silver, besides we do not mean to be instrumental in obviating any of the inconveniences the people feel from the want of a National Bank.

*F.* Indeed! So, although you enjoy special privileges, upon consideration that you will accommodate the people, you will not accommodate them unless they surrender their independence, adopt your opinions, and follow the policy you dictate!

*M.* To tell you the truth, I care less about a Bank of the United States than I did, because I see how we can get along very well without it; but I am opposed to your Sub-Treasury plans.

*M.* Indeed! I should like to see you try it.

*F.* We can do it by making runs on you until you become accommodating.

*M.* That would be monstrous!

*F.* How monstrous?

*M.* There is not gold enough in the country to supply the banks and meet the wants of the people.

*F.* Perhaps there is not now gold enough in the country; but there soon will be. Our Southern gold mines supply a million or two every year, and almost all of the many millions of dollars brought into the country within the last few years, is gold. You cannot deny that the quantity of gold in the country has greatly increased since the passage of the gold bill.

*M.* That cannot be denied. Formerly, we never saw a gold piece; now we see such pieces almost every day; but still there is not enough to make gold the only legal tender.

*F.* I am told that gold is the only legal tender for considerable sums in France and England, and in most European countries, and I have no doubt it would have been better for the people if it had been so here; but that is not what I am contending for. All I insist on is, that if the banks will not afford the people all reasonable accommodations in this respect, the people may make them do it, by concert among themselves. The banks, if they will, may render any change unnecessary; but if they force an inconvenience on the people, and use that as an argument in favor of a National Bank, the people have a right to remove the inconvenience by the more simple and constitutional process of forcing these privileged institutions to shell out all their specie—gold and silver.

*M.* I have no doubt that our bank will pay gold whenever any of our citizens may want it to pay travelling expenses.

*F.* Very well; then our citizens can get as good a general currency to travel upon as the notes of a Bank of the United States. Can they not?

*M.* Yes—no doubt of it.

*F.* Then, there goes another of your arguments in favor of a National Bank; and if all the other State banks will not be equally just and liberal, the people have only to make them so by law; for the people are the Government in this country.

*M.* Well, but you cannot as safely send a gold coin in a letter as a bank note, and it would be a great convenience if there were a bank furnishing a general currency for remittance.

*F.* Do you send bank notes of any sort by letter to New York to pay for your goods; or would you do it if there were a general paper currency?

*M.* No; that was the old way of doing business; but since our bank has commenced dealing in domestic exchange, I find it more safe and convenient to buy of them a bill of exchange on the bank they do business with in New York. The postage is less, and I avoid all risk.

*F.* So your State bank furnishes you a kind of paper for remittance which you prefer to United States Bank notes?

*M.* Why yes; it is more convenient, and the risk is less.

*F.* And after that you are willing to pay the difference of exchange?

*M.* Yes, certainly.

*F.* Well, there goes your last argument in favor of a National Bank. What is for your interest, is for every man's interest. It is every man's interest to go to a bank or banker and buy a bill of exchange, when he has money to remit, rather than enclose bank notes, unless the sum be small and the distance short, when the notes of State banks answer the purposes as well as any. And are there not ten places now where bills of exchange can be had, to one as this business was formerly managed?

*M.* I suppose there are. Before the depots were removed in 1833, very few of the State banks dealt in exchange, and we all had to go to the branches of the United States Bank; but after that event, most of the State banks entered into that business, and exchange could be had in ten places for one. The business was mostly broken up by the suspension of payment by the banks; but they are all going into it again.

*F.* Cannot your bank furnish exchange as low as the United States Branch Bank ever did?

*M.* Yes, lower, and make money by it. But the Branch did not furnish it as low as they might have done.

*F.* Indeed! Then, in consequence of their monopoly, they made you pay more than they ought to have done.

*M.* I think so.

*F.* And you are in favor of restoring this monopoly which taxed you unreasonably to make an extravagant dividend for its stockholders?

*M.* But I put higher prices upon my goods to make it up.

*F.* Just so—it comes out of the labor and sweat of the farmer at last. You sold your goods to us at higher prices, and made us pay the extravagant rate of exchange which the United States bank took out of you. If this is not an argument why you should be opposed to a National Bank, it is an excellent one why WE should.

*M.* To tell you the truth, I care less about a Bank of the United States than I did, because I see how we can get along very well without it; but I am opposed to your Sub-Treasury plans.

*F.* I am glad to hear you are getting to care little about a National Bank. I hope that upon a little more experience, which is the safest teacher, you will not be so much opposed to the Sub-Treasury, as you call it.

*M.* But I have no time to argue further to-day.

*F.* (solas.) The Sub-Treasury—I should not care a fig about it, if I did not want to make money as a bank stock-holder, by lending out the public funds on interest; and make money as a merchant or a speculator, by borrowing

nebec & not in the Democratic county of Waldo!

If the proportion of votes to the population, had been as great throughout the State as it was

in the County of Kennebec, the aggregate vote

would have exceeded 92,000, whereas it actu-

ally falls a little short of 90,000. "The enormous

increase of votes," so loudly harped upon as evi-

dence of frauds committed by the democratic

party, is actually exhibited in Kennebec to a

greater relative extent, than in all the other

Counties. We hope the federal party will take

care hereafter, not to start topics of discussion,

which, in the end, will redound only to their own

confusion.

From the Boston Advocate.

FALSE CREDIT SYSTEM.

A Mississippi editor observes: "At the ensuing fall and spring terms, the people of this State will have an immense debt to pay—we forbear to name our estimate of the amount—they cannot pay it; and if the demand be persisted in, nine-tenths of them must be turned out of house and home, particularly in the great central cities."

A pretty commentary this upon the vaunted "credit system" of Messrs. Tallmadge and Whitney. Does it not cause the blood to rush to the heart and cheek of every American citizen when he reads the above account? Here are "nine-tenths of the people" of a State—a State, too, of as high-minded citizens as any in Union—in the hands of the sheriff! What is political freedom to the man with bankruptcy before him, and the jail to the end of the prospect? Imagine, for one moment, the anxiety, apprehension and despair produced by such a state of things; the temptations to dishonesty, the wear and tear of feeling; the inevitable loss of happiness; peace of mind gone forever.—

And yet with all these evils staring us in the face, nay, already fallen upon us, there are men

so deaf to the counsels of sad experience, that if the party of the people and of popular rights; and this idea, industriously inculcated for so long a time, it is not easy suddenly to eradicate.

There is much truth in this as well as a good deal of error. The *Atlas* and its whole gang of federal organs cannot, by any tricks of theirs, by the application of "nicknames" or opprobrious epithets to the democratic party, change the conviction which has already been established.

They have been allowed to hold themselves out as the exclusive friends of their opponents, and popular friends to the people and of popular rights.

The *Atlas* election has opened the eyes of the *Atlas*; it says :

"Those may sneer who choose at appeals to popular sympathies, and to the popular imagination, but it is only by means like these, that masses of men, whether great or small, are ever brought to act together; and in our opinion the feelings and sympathies, or if you will, the passions and prejudices of the many, are quite as worthy of being courted and humored, as the feelings and sympathies, the passions and prejudices of the few."

Heretofore all the *respectability* has been found in the few. And not only all the "respectability," but all the "morals and learning and talent." The many have been denominated the "rabble," and considered as unworthy and incompetent to take a part in political affairs; and therefore should be denied the right of suffrage. But now what a wonderful change!

They are "worthy of being courted and humored." Aye, there's the rub. The federalists cannot get into power without them. This is the game of hypocrisy must be played with a master hand. The many must be "courted and humored."

Professions of attachment to a popular government must be made—and here you have it:

"At all events, our government is a purely regulated popular government; and in the long run those who will always have the ascendancy in it, who take the most pains to secure the favor and good will, and to gain the ear, of the people. Those who would have votes must descend into the forum and take the voters by the hand. They must condescend to shake the huge paws." They shun upon and flatter, and pretend to have a great regard for the dear people, whom in their hearts they despise; whom they have abused and disregarded, and trampled upon. All this must they do, or they will be sundered, government, and the people.

Why shouting, buzzing and exulting at the national distress, firing cannon, displaying flags, forming processions, eating dinners, making speeches, vilifying the government, illuminating cities, revelling, carousing and rousing in midnight pow wows. One year has passed away, the democratic administration of MARTIN VAN BUREN has stood firm, the banks have resumed, the treasury is relieved, specie is abundant, skin plasters worthless, confidence restored, business rapidly improving, commerce flourishing, mechanics employed, exchanges

flourishing, but makes but few votes. This counts and represents a small majority of the votes. Now settle the question.

ANOTHER FEDERAL REACTION.

Another trial to elect a representative took place in Biddulph on Monday last, which resulted in the election of the democratic candidate, COL. HANNAH LOWELL. Biddulph last year

cannot come into power—their party can never succeed. This is the admission of the *Atlas*, sent a federalist, and on the 10th inst. gave a something more. The people have been too much abused, and too often deceived by them, to put any reliance upon their expressions of resentful

penitence for the past, or love for the people at the present.

We say, then, that the result of the election in Maine has worked wonders. It has compelled the organ of the federal party in this city to profess a love and respect for the people, for democracy; and if this profession does not make a stir among the "blue lights," we shall be much mistaken. It is not improbable but that a change of name will take place in a few days among the federalists. They will undoubtedly be all democrats, and their party the democratic party.

A CASE.

A Mr. Knights, belonging in Falmouth, now living in Medford, Mass., has acknowledged his travelling expenses were paid for the purpose of his returning here and voting the federal ticket at the

evening direct our steps through those pros' paragraph you have selected is not a correct re-  
menades where the ladies move; we shall find part of what I said on that occasion. The ve-  
shops filled with purchasers, and heaps piled by next sentence does, to my mind, show that  
on heaps of satins, silks and other rich goods, which the report could not be correct, and having ex-  
have been displayed to the fair customers during the day. In the evening, if we extend our obser-  
vation, we shall find that every place of amuse-  
ment is well filled, and that our public houses  
are crowded. We say that this argues a healthy  
state of things, and when we find it so, we like  
to make it known to our grumbling neighbors,  
to smooth their wrinkles and make them more  
comfortable under their unfortunate hypo-  
condriacal fever, for there will always be a few  
miserable beings in society who will never be  
able to see the glad sun of prosperity, shine  
it ever so brilliantly and full upon them.

Boston Post.

**Very Good.**—A friend of ours happened on business in Boston, near the Maine election. He fell in company with a Boston federalist, who not knowing his political views, immediately commenced divulging the secrets of the management of the Boston federalists to defeat the democracy of Maine. "There will be a severe contest (said he) in Maine, but we have outmaneuvered the Democrats. We have sent home from as far south as Charleston. From 1500 to 2000 Maine tars have been sent home to vote; these Maine tars know something; they are not like the N. Y. tars who scarcely know their right hand from their left; their votes tell, as the democrats know nothing about it." On Thursday after the election, our friend met the Boston gentleman again, and enquired of him what had become of his Maine tars?—"They are all tar-tars," said he, "and I believe I stretched the story a little, when conversing with you the other day. I don't think we sent home so many—but it is my honest opinion that every d—l of those we did send voted against us.—*Hartford Times*.

**Vermont—The Result.**—We copy the following from the *Montpelier Patriot*, of September 17:

We have returns for Governor from 134 towns, which we have collected and revised with considerable care, especially sifting and correcting those contained in our last. It may be proper to remark that we have taken the vote for Congress in 12 towns in Franklin county to make out this number, giving Jenison the votes of both Allen and Briggs, and assigning those of Mr Smith to Bradley, which, it is believed, will vary a little from the actual result—not 20 votes. The vote for Governor and Congress, so far as we have been able to compare them, fully warrant this conclusion. In 184 towns Jenison has 20,148—Bradley 16,130—Jenison's majority 4018. The number of votes cast will doubtless exceed those of last year, but the gulf will be about the same to each—nothing to brag of any way.

We had returns for Representatives, in our last, from 138 towns, which send 56 democrats and 83 federalists. We add to our list, this week 87 towns, which return 21 democrats and 66 federalists; making the representation stand, so far, 77 democrats 148 federalists.

The Senate stands precisely as it did last year; 20 federalists and 10 democrats. We have lost three in Orange and gained one in Franklin (Mr Hubbard) one in Chittenden (Mr Chittenden) and one in Bennington (Mr Robinson.)

**Fourth District.**—We have what purports to be full returns from this District in the St. Albans (fed.) *Messenger*, as follows—Smith (dem.) 4,100; Allen 3,703 and Briggs 367 (both fed.)—Scattering 45; which gives S. 397 majority over A. and 30 over A. and B., but makes him fall behind A., B. and C. 15 votes. This is positively too bad. Other accounts and reports say that Smith is elected by a small majority—some say 6 and others 8 votes. Nothing but the official canvass can settle the question, the contest is so close."

Eastern Argus.

From the *Portland Standard*.

**LATEST FROM ENGLAND.**

London papers to the 15th have been received at New York. Prices of Cotton had not much varied—though the demand was somewhat relaxed. The demand for money was increased—the rates of discount had advanced from 2 3-4 to 3 1-2 per cent.

The following correspondence, which explains itself, had passed between Mr. O'Connell and the American Minister.

23 Portland Place, Aug. 9.

Sir:—My attention has been called to the publication, in the last *Spectator*, of a speech which purports to have been delivered by you at a public meeting in Birmingham, in which you are reported to have used the following language in relation to myself: "I believe their very ambassador here, is a slave-breeder, one of those beings who rear up slaves for the purpose of traffic. Is it possible that America would send here a man who traffics in blood, and who is a disgrace to human nature?" I desire to know from you whether this is a correct report of what you said on that occasion, and with that view address to you this communication.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

A. STEVENSON.

To Daniel O'Connell, Esq., &c.

16, Pall Mall, Aug. 10.

Sir:—In consequence of your letter of yesterday's date, I examined the report of my speech at Birmingham, in the *Spectator* of the 17th inst. and have no hesitation in saying that

I have the honor to be, Sir,  
Your very ob't servt.

DANIEL O'CONNELL.

23 Portland Place, Aug. 11, 1838.

Sir:—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of last evening, in answer to the one from myself of the preceding day. Presuming that you intended your reply as a disavowal of the offensive expressions contained in that part of your reported speech which had allusion to myself, and to which your attention has been called, I am satisfied with the answer you have given. As an incorrect report of your speech has been made public through the press, I beg to inform you that I deem it due to myself that the correspondence which has taken place, should also be published.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,  
Your obedient servant.

A. STEVENSON.

To D. O'Connell, Esq., &c.

OXFORD DEMOCRAT.

Paris, October 2, 1838.

It is difficult to say whether the federalists are depressed by their recent defeat in this State, or by the signs of returning prosperity which are every where exhibited. The favorable season and bountiful crops have been so many disaster to them, in a political point of view. These prophets of evil find their predictions falsified one after another, and in vain have they invoked to their aid famine, pestilence and distress. Misfortune to the country is prosperity to their party. Some men have been weak enough to join the federal party from being persuaded into the belief that the pressure in the money market was the source of all the evils they felt or fancied, and that this was caused by the acts of the Administration—that times never could become good again until democracy was abased, and federalism exalted—

that a federal administration and a National Bank were necessary to the resumption of specie payments by the banks, and the revival of business. Bad seasons and short crops have been occasioned by the specie circular, and the want of a National Bank, if one may believe federal newspapers, and so little regard is paid to common sense and daily experience, that we have heard of men of respectability, and of sense, when they choose to exercise it, so imbued with the stale caud of their party, as to say that the present hard times among the farmers were owing to the derangement of the currency.—

When pressed to say in what the hard times consisted, they admit what no one can deny—that the crops, taken

together, are unusually abundant—that all which the farmer has to sell, meets with a ready sale, and com-

mends a high price. Nor is the price of the few things

which the farmer has to buy, proportionably high. If

then, these are hard times for the farmer, we know not, or when, he is to expect good times. Indeed,

these complaints come from political breakers, who, dis-

heartened and enraged by defeat, predict the distresses

they hope for, while the industrious farmer is grateful

for the blessings he receives and rejoices in the plen-

to-tomorrow which rewards his toils—and satisfied with

the profits derived from his industry. Every day's ex-

perience is giving the lie to the gloomy predictions of

federal politicians, who hoped to triumph in the misfor-

tunes of the community. The banks have resumed specie payments—business is active—the laborer finds em-  
ployment, and good wages—the crops are good and pro-  
portionably high, all in spite of the predictions, and may we not add, of our opponents. Federalism sinks as the

country rises. Democracy triumphs when the country prospers. The efforts of disappointed politicians to cre-  
ate and continue distress, have been defeated by the ac-  
tivity and intelligence of the people, and the lesson has  
been learned, that so far from a National Bank being es-  
sential to the prosperity of the country, we can thrive  
without it, and even in spite of the efforts of its friends  
and advocates to embarrass the business of the country.

The oft repeated assertion that we cannot get along

without a National Bank is being daily refuted by ex-

perience, and the people are beginning to enquire whether

our State banks are not more numerous than is ne-

cessary or safe for the community.

The federal presses in this State, are laboring hard to

excuse their late defeat and to encourage each other not

to despair. There is as much truth in the excuses they

invent for their defeat as there was in their stories of

great changes and reaction and anticipated triumphs, be-

fore the election. It would be a sufficient reply to all

their accusations of unfairness in their opponents to

read them a page from any of their papers, before elec-

tion, the last are entitled to the same confidence as

the first, and no more. We shrink from no scrutiny

to invite the fullest investigation. If there was fraud

let it be exposed and punished. Let the charges of bri-

bery, corruption and illegal voting rest where they be-

long. Those only are responsible for such acts who

would be guilty of them, or attempt to justify or excuse

them.

A Term of the S. J. Court will be held in this town next week

From the Eastern Argus.

We commend to the particular attention of our readers, the following reply of the Hon. Levi Woodbury, to an invitation of a Committee of his political friends, to a Public Dinner. It is the most condensed and unanswerable refutation of the charges against the Administration, that we have seen. The copy was handed in for publication at so late an hour, that we have not room for further comments in this paper.

HON. LEVI WOODBURY,

Secretary of the Treasury.

Sir:—The undersigned, a Committee selected for the purpose, by the Democratic Republicans of Portland and its vicinity, have the honor of tendering you a Public Dinner, at such time as to you shall be most agreeable.

In attending the duty assigned us, we have great pleasure in expressing to you in behalf of our constituents and for ourselves individually, the high estimation in which your public services

are held, at a time when extraordinary and un-  
warrantable embarrassments have been thrust in your way.

by men who prefer the ruin of our Republic, to

its safe & successful government by the present

Administration.

We have the honor to be,

With high respect,

Your Ob't Servt,

MARK HARRIS,

PARKER McCORB,

RICHARD ODELL,

JOSEPH BURBANK,

IRA CROCKER,

ALBERT WINSLOW,

AUGUSTINE HAINES,

LEMUEL DYER,

WM. EVANS,

JERE. HASKELL,

Portland, Sept. 19, 1838.

PORTLAND, Sept. 20th, 1838.

Gentlemen.—I regret that the urgent demands of business, must prevent my acceptance of your polite invitation to a public dinner with the Democratic Republicans of Portland and vicinity.

Some of the embarrassments which have been thrust in the way of the execution of my official duties, are justly, pronounced by you "extraordinary and remarkable"—since they have consisted of assaults on the administration, sometimes for measures, which it never proposed—sometimes for motives, it never entertained—and often for designs, which it never formed.

I speak of the past and present administration as one, knowing from my connection with them, their similarity, of principles; and I congratulate you, that those embarrassments are fast vanishing before the dispassionate by the people at large, which always, under our system of government, remove in due time, unjust suspicions, and incorrect delusions.

When the prejudices of the moment shall fade away, it will appear passing strange in history, that many of those embarrassments should have assumed such inconsistent forms. That an administration, which, on all occasions, has so studiously avoided the exercise of any doubtful full powers, should repeatedly be charged with usurpation: that, devoted to the strict construction of the constitution, which was advocated by Jefferson and Madison in 1798, it should be rashly arraigned for an intention to seize on the wide power of both the purse and the sword—and that, resisting, as it has done, all unnecessary appropriations, it should be attacked for a want of economy by some of the very persons, who voted not only for those appropriations, but millions more.

That, during the past year, after surmounting the remarkable difficulties of the crisis, and discharging every claim, however large, with promptitude and mostly in specie or a full equivalent, it should be censured for not having been paid in specie, and by those, who then paid nothing in specie, and were the advocates of depreciated paper; and should ultimately be denounced as bankrupt by numbers, who were receiving from it pecuniary indulgence and are still largely indebted to the public Treasury.

That, sustaining the banks, so long as they sustained the laws, and not opposed either to them or the credit system, while properly conducted, the administration should be violently assailed as their enemy: insisting on a sound currency for both the government and the people, it should be reproached with desiring a better one for the former, by those who forebore to insist on such a currency for either: proposing additional guards for the safe keeping of the public money, it should be inculpated for endangering its custody by some, who voted against those further securities, and by others, who were withholding that money from the urgent necessities of the government: and, after procuring for the mercantile interest, many millions of foreign indemnities, extensive by improving harbors and rivers—constructing light houses and breakwaters—making several commercial treaties of great value, and reducing, where not removing entirely, many burthensome imposts on trade, it should encounter virulent opposition, under the groundless pretence of its being hostile to commerce.

In fine, that the Administration, which looking to the popular will, as expressed under the laws and constitution, for its guide—discountenancing monopolies—upholding equal rights at home, and vindicating national honor abroad, should be criminated as arbitrary, imbecile and unfaithful, by opponents, whose general creed is to disregard both popular and legislative instruc-

—tions, and some of whom, after growing rich on exclusive privileges, have not only abused those attempting to enforce the Acts of Congress when obnoxious, but certainly have not themselves exhibited, in every emergency, that scrupulous adherence to the laws, which a real love of order, sound morals, and a due respect for the constituted authorities would seem to indicate.

Indeed, while proposing every thing, which appeared constitutional, and conducive to public relief, it should meet the unpatriotic return of constant complaints for doing too little—constant opposition to all it proposed to do—and constant refusal to propose or to do any thing better.

But, thanks to "the democratic republicans" you represent, and others of like intelligence, firmness and patriotism, the vessel of State still rides out the storm.

Numerous opponents as well as friends of the administration, after full and candid investigation, have become supporters of measures they before disapproved.

The course of our cause—the noble cause over all christendom—of the greatest good to

the greatest number, will, therefore, still be on-  
ward.

The late glorious victory, in your State—so

young and yet so distinguished among her sis-

ters, is a striking evidence of the sure progress

of truth; and the Star in the East, breaking

forth with such splendor, is, I trust, the harbinger

for brighter day for the whole Union.

Respectfully,

Levi Woodbury.

To Mark Harris, Parker McCobb, Rich. Odell,

Jos. Burbank, Ira Crocker, Albert Winslow,

Aug. Haines, Lemuel Dyer, Wm. Evans, and

Jere. Haskell, Esquires.

From the *Sacred Democrat*.

DEMOCRATIC

